

## REMARKS

Claims 1-24 and 27-34 are pending in the present Application. Claims 19-24, 30, 32, and 34 have been allowed, Claims 1-6, 8-18, 27-29, 31 and 33 have been canceled without prejudice to Applicants' rights thereto, leaving Claim 7 for further consideration upon entry of the present Amendment. Reconsideration and allowance of the entire case is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

### Interview Summary

Applicants' representative, Joel T. Charlton, called Examiner Mulpuri on January 19, 2004 to discuss some informalities noted in the Office Action. More particularly, Applicants' representative requested that the Examiner clarify what claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), since the Office Action did not set forth the claims being rejected. The Examiner indicated that Claims 6, 10, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-17, 27-29, 31, and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,215,250 to Hirano et al.

This rejection is moot with regards to Claims 1-5, 8-9, 11-17, 27-29, 31, and 33, since those claims have been canceled. However, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claim 7.

To anticipate a claim, a reference must disclose each and every element of the claim. *Lewmar Marine v. Varient Inc.*, 3 U.S.P.Q.2d 1766 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Claim 7 comprises, *inter alia*, the following element: "disposing between said substrate and a layer material source a mask having a smaller area than said substrate and including an opening corresponding to one or more of the plurality of regions where said layer is formed".

It is briefly noted that in the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance stated that "the prior art neither teach nor suggest teaching mask having smaller than said substrate...." Since Claim 7 comprises "a mask having a smaller area than said substrate", Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 7 was made in error.

More particularly, since Hirano et al. at least fail to teach "disposing between said substrate and a layer material source a mask having a smaller area than said substrate and including an opening corresponding to one or more of the plurality of regions where said layer is formed", Hirano et al. fail to teach each and every element of Applicants' Claim 7. Accordingly, Claim 7 is not anticipated and is therefore allowable over Hirano et al.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 6, 10, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,255,775 to Ikuko et al. or U.S. Patent No. 6,215,250 to Hirano et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,087,274 to Tonucci et al.

This rejection is moot, as Claims 6, 10, and 18 have been canceled without prejudice.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By 

Joel T. Charlton

Registration No. 52,721

Date: March 28, 2005  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone (860) 286-2929  
Facsimile (860) 286-0115  
Customer No.: 23413

YKI-0078  
09/966,692